

09/774,992

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 15-21 are amended. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Claim 1 recites a method of operating a financial document processing system. The method comprises the steps of (a) monitoring a number of operating parameters associated with operation of the system, (b) storing a number of operating parameters of step (a) into a database, (c) retrieving a fault finding test script file which contains a number of tests which can be performed on the system, (d) performing tests contained in the retrieved fault finding test script file of step (c) using at least some of the parameters stored in the database to provide a number of signals indicative of a potential fault condition, and (e) updating the retrieved fault finding test script file of step (c) based upon test results from tests which have been performed on the system in step (d).

None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests a method of operating a financial document processing system, wherein the method comprises the steps of (a) monitoring a number of operating parameters associated with operation of the system, (b) storing a number of operating parameters of step (a) into a database, (c) retrieving a fault finding test script file which contains a number of tests which can be performed on the system, (d) performing tests contained in the retrieved fault finding test script file of step (c) using at least some of the parameters stored in the database to provide a number of signals indicative of a potential fault condition, and (e) updating the retrieved fault finding test script file of step (c) based upon test results from tests which have been performed on the system in step (d). Thus, claim 1 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for the reasons claim 1 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 2 further recites the step of (f) displaying a message to assist an operator in diagnosing the potential fault condition before the potential fault condition actually occurs. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 2 in combination with the structure

09/774,992

recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 2 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for the reasons claim 1 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 3 further recites the step of (f) periodically determining if the signals indicative of the potential fault condition match a predetermined fault pattern. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 3 in combination with the structure recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 3 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 4 depends from claim 3 and is allowable for the reasons claim 3 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 4 further recites the step of (g) alerting an operator when the signals indicative of the potential fault condition match the predetermined fault pattern. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 4 in combination with the structure recited in claim 3. Thus, claim 4 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 5 depends from claim 3 and is allowable for the reasons claim 3 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 5 further recites the step of (g) logging a fault event when the signals indicative of the potential fault condition match the predetermined fault pattern. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 5 in combination with the structure recited in claim 3. Thus, claim 5 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for the reasons claim 1 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 6 further recites the step of (f) displaying a number of actions on a screen to assist the operator in diagnosing the potential fault condition. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 6 in combination with the structure recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 6

09/774,992

patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 7 depends from claim 6 and is allowable for the reasons claim 6 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 7 further recites that step (d) includes the step of (f-1) displaying specific instructions to provide a step-by-step approach to diagnosing the potential fault condition. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 7 in combination with the structure recited in claim 6. Thus, claim 7 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 8 recites a financial document processing system comprising means for monitoring a number of operating parameters associated with operation of the system, means for storing a number of operating parameters into a database, means for retrieving a fault finding test script file which contains a number of tests which can be performed on the system, means for performing tests contained in the retrieved fault finding test script file using at least some of the parameters stored in the database to provide a number of signals indicative of a potential fault condition, and means for updating the retrieved fault finding test script file based upon test results from tests which have been performed on the system.

None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests a financial document processing system comprising means for monitoring a number of operating parameters associated with operation of the system, means for storing a number of operating parameters into a database, means for retrieving a fault finding test script file which contains a number of tests which can be performed on the system, means for performing tests contained in the retrieved fault finding test script file using at least some of the parameters stored in the database to provide a number of signals indicative of a potential fault condition, and means for updating the retrieved fault finding test script file based upon test results from tests which have been performed on the system. Thus, claim 8 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

09/774,992

Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and is allowable for the reasons claim 8 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 9 further recites means for displaying a message to assist an operator in diagnosing the potential fault condition before the potential fault condition actually occurs. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 9 in combination with the structure recited in claim 8. Thus, claim 9 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 10 depends from claim 8 and is allowable for the reasons claim 8 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 10 further recites means for periodically determining if the signals indicative of the potential fault condition match a predetermined fault pattern. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 10 in combination with the structure recited in claim 8. Thus, claim 10 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10 and is allowable for the reasons claim 10 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 11 further recites means for alerting an operator when the signals indicative of the potential fault condition match the predetermined fault pattern. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 11 in combination with the structure recited in claim 10. Thus, claim 11 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 12 depends from claim 10 and is allowable for the reasons claim 10 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 12 further recites means for logging a fault event when the signals indicative of the potential fault condition match the predetermined fault pattern. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 12 in combination with the structure recited in claim 10. Thus, claim 12 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

09/774,992

Claim 13 depends from claim 8 and is allowable for the reasons claim 8 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 13 further recites means for displaying a number of actions on a screen to assist the operator in diagnosing the potential fault condition. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 13 in combination with the structure recited in claim 8. Thus, claim 13 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 14 depends from claim 13 and is allowable for the reasons claim 13 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 14 further recites that the displaying means includes means for displaying specific instructions to provide a step-by-step approach to diagnosing the potential fault condition. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 14 in combination with the structure recited in claim 13. Thus, claim 14 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 15 recites a program storage medium readable by a computer having a memory. The medium tangibly embodies one or more programs of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for operating a financial document processing system. The method comprises the steps of (a) monitoring a number of operating parameters associated with operation of the system, (b) storing a number of operating parameters of step (a) into a database, (c) retrieving a fault finding test script file which contains a number of tests which can be performed on the system, (d) performing tests contained in the retrieved fault finding test script file of step (c) using at least some of the parameters stored in the database to provide a number of signals indicative of a potential fault condition, and (e) updating the retrieved fault finding test script file of step (c) based upon test results from tests which have been performed on the system in step (d).

None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests a program storage medium readable by a computer having a memory, wherein the medium tangibly embodies one or more programs of instructions executable by the computer to

09/774,992

perform method steps for operating a financial document processing system, and wherein the method comprises the steps of (a) monitoring a number of operating parameters associated with operation of the system, (b) storing a number of operating parameters of step (a) into a database, (c) retrieving a fault finding test script file which contains a number of tests which can be performed on the system, (d) performing tests contained in the retrieved fault finding test script file of step (c) using at least some of the parameters stored in the database to provide a number of signals indicative of a potential fault condition, and (e) updating the retrieved fault finding test script file of step (c) based upon test results from tests which have been performed on the system in step (d). Thus, claim 15 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 16 depends from claim 15 and is allowable for the reasons claim 15 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 16 further recites that the method further comprises the step of (f) displaying a message to assist an operator in diagnosing the potential fault condition before the potential fault condition actually occurs. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 16 in combination with the structure recited in claim 15. Thus, claim 16 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 17 depends from claim 15 and is allowable for the reasons claim 15 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 17 further recites that the method further comprises the step of (f) periodically determining if the signals indicative of the potential fault condition match a predetermined fault pattern. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 17 in combination with the structure recited in claim 15. Thus, claim 17 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 18 depends from claim 17 and is allowable for the reasons claim 17 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 18 further recites that the method further

09/774,992

comprises the step of (g) alerting an operator when the signals indicative of the potential fault condition match the predetermined fault pattern. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 18 in combination with the structure recited in claim 17. Thus, claim 18 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 19 depends from claim 17 and is allowable for the reasons claim 17 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 19 further recites that the method further comprises the step of (g) logging a fault event when the signals indicative of the potential fault condition match the predetermined fault pattern. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 19 in combination with the structure recited in claim 17. Thus, claim 19 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 20 depends from claim 15 and is allowable for the reasons claim 15 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 20 further recites that the method further comprises the step of (f) displaying a number of actions on a screen to assist the operator in diagnosing the potential fault condition. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 20 in combination with the structure recited in claim 15. Thus, claim 20 patentably defines over the prior art including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

Claim 21 depends from claim 20 and is allowable for the reasons claim 20 is allowable and for the specific limitations recited therein. Claim 21 further recites that the method further comprises the step of (f-1) displaying specific instructions to provide a step-by-step approach to diagnosing the potential fault condition. None of the prior art including the prior art references of record discloses or suggests the structure recited in claim 21 in combination with the structure recited in claim 20. Thus, claim 21 patentably defines over the prior art

09/774,992

including the prior art references of record, whether taken singularly or in combination, and is therefore allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Chan  
Reg. No. 33,663  
Attorney for Applicant

NCR Corporation, Law Department, WHQ-5E  
1700 S. Patterson Blvd., Dayton, OH 45479-0001  
Tel. No. 937-445-4956/Fax No. 937-445-3733

DEC 12 2003